



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,899	06/25/2003	David C. Holland	HOL-1002CP	4893
24923	7590	07/20/2004	EXAMINER	
PAUL S MADAN MADAN, MOSSMAN & SRIRAM, PC 2603 AUGUSTA, SUITE 700 HOUSTON, TX 77057-1130			HOEY, ALISSA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3765	

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/603,899

Applicant(s)

HOLLAND, DAVID C.

Examiner

Alissa L. Hoey

Art Unit

3765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION


Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Holland (US 5,991,920).



In regard to Claims 1 and 2, Holland provides a swimsuit (1) having a loop (3) adapted to completely encircle a human waist. A swimsuit body (4) separable at one location by decoupling a corresponding fastening device (10, 10a) and a storage compartment (2) on the swimsuit body (4) for compactly stowing the body (4). The loop (3) is positioned relative to the swimsuit body (4) so that when the fastening device (10, 10a) is engaged the swimsuit (1) can be secured on a user's body.

In regard to Claim 5, Holland provides a method of removing part of a swimsuit body (4) that is separable at one point by a fastening device (10, 10a) while leaving the

Art Unit: 3765

swimsuit loop (3) attached to a human body. Decoupling the fastening device (10, 10a) on a body of the swimsuit (4), compacting the body of the swimsuit (4) into a small space and storing the compacted body of the swimsuit using at least one storage compartment (2) on the body of the swimsuit (4). Finally, using the loop (3) that encircles the user for supporting the swimsuit (1) while compacted in the storage compartment (2) on the user.

In regard to Claim 6, Holland provides the method of compacting the body (4) of the swimsuit (1) using the at least one storage compartment (2) and storing through an opening (12) at an end of the storage compartment (2).

In regard to Claim 7, Holland provides the at least one storage compartment (2) comprises two storage compartments (column 2, lines 29-41).

In regard to Claims 8 and 9, Holland provides a method of making a collapsible swimsuit (1) comprising separating a swimsuit body (4) at one position (10, 10a), attaching a piece of material (2) to the body of the swimsuit (4) defining a storage compartment (2), attaching at least one fastening device (10, 10a) to the swimsuit (4) at positions of separation and attaching a loop (3) capable of completely encircling a user's waist to the swimsuit (1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 4 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holland.

Holland provides a collapsible swimsuit (1) as described above in claims 1 and 8. However, Holland fails to teach the loop being a decorative chain that is resistant to corrosion and the front of the swimsuit having a greater width than the back of the swimsuit.

In regard to Claims 3, 4, 10, 13 and 14, Holland provides a loop (3) consisting of an elastic material and a tubular member (column 2, lines 26-29).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to having provided the loop in a chain material that is resistant to corrosion because Applicant has not disclosed that providing the loop in a chain material that is resistant to corrosion provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the loop being any material including an elastic fabric material or a chain that is resistant to corrosion because as long as the loop secures the swimsuit to the user's waist it can be made out of any material as desired. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Holland to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3, 4, 10, 13 and 14.

In regard to Claims 11 and 12, Holland provides a swimsuit (10) comprising a loop (3) adapted to completely encircle a human waist. A body (4) having a front end and a rear end and a rear end. A fastener (10, 10a) for detachable coupling the rear end

Art Unit: 3765

of the body (4) to the loop and a storage compartment (2) on the front of the swimsuit (1) for compactly stowing the body (4). The loop (3) is positioned relative to the swimsuit body (4) so that when the fastener (10, 10a) is attached the swimsuit (1) may be worn by a user.

However, Holland fails to teach the front end of the swimsuit body having a greater width than the rear end of the swimsuit body.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the front end of the swimsuit body having a greater width than the rear end of the swimsuit body because Applicant has not disclosed that providing the front end of the swimsuit body having a greater width than the rear end of the swimsuit body provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the front end of the swim suit body having a greater, smaller or equal width than the rear end because the width of the front end and the rear end does not effect the function of the swimsuit but only provides different coverage of a user's body. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Holland to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kowatsch, Cass, DeWan, Beard, Greene, Kemper, Fjelstul,


Art Unit: 3765

Waldman et al., Fernandez, Kehoe, Garcia, Kennedy, Lipton, Ruitter et al., Cramer, Yturria and Mosha et al. are all cited to show closely related garments.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alissa L. Hoey whose telephone number is (703) 308-6094. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Calvert can be reached on (703) 305-1025. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alissa L. Hoey
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700